

## **REMARKS**

Claims 17-27 and 33-44 are pending in this application, and all claims stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Webber et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0252360. This rejection is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that Webber is not available as a 35 USC 102(e) reference against the present application.

It is respectfully noted that this rejection was raised and overcome earlier in the prosecution of the present application. A precisely similar rejection was made (at least in so far as claims 21, 22, 37, 39 and 40 were concerned) in the Office Action issued January 1, 2006. Applicants repeat below the relevant portion of their Response dated May 11, 2006 to this rejection. Following this Response, the Office Action of July 27, 2006 stated that the response was moot in view of the new grounds of rejection, namely a similar rejection based upon LeCain et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0027327.

The present application was filed September 2, 2003 and hence is entitled to at least this date for purposes of 35 USC 102(e) (although, of course, applicants reserve to right to demonstrate, should it be necessary to do so, that this application is entitled to an earlier date). Webber was filed only on February 10, 2004, after the filing date of the present application. Although Webber is a continuation-in-part of Application Serial No. 10/064,389, filed July 9, 2002, this parent application does not contain the crucial Figure 2 and related description of Webber, as may readily be seen by referring to U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0025855 (already of record in this case), the published form of Application Serial No. 10/064,389. Accordingly, Figure 2 and the related description of Webber are not entitled to a 35 USC 102(e) date earlier than February 10, 2004, and Webber is not available as a basis for a 35 USC 102(e) rejection using such material. It is believed to be self-evident that without Figure 2 and the related description, Webber does not furnish a basis for a 35 USC 102(e) rejection. Incidentally, it is respectfully noted that Paragraph 26 of Webber refers explicitly to the present application

*Duthaler et al.*  
Serial No. 10/605,024  
Response to Office Action, September 4, 2007  
Page 3

in a manner which should make it clear that the present application is the earlier disclosure of the "double release film" which forms the subject of all the present claims.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims in this application is respectfully requested.

Since the prescribed period for responding to the Office Action expired June 21, a Petition for a three month extension of this period is filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted  
/David J. Cole/  
David J. Cole  
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation  
733 Concord Avenue  
Cambridge MA 02138

Telephone (617) 499-6069  
Fax (617) 499-6200  
E-mail [dcole@cink.com](mailto:dcole@cink.com)